DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 128 FL 019 102

AUTHOR Piscitelli, Christine D.
TITLE Development of an In-Service Course To Assist Subject-Matter Teachers in Addressing the Unique Needs of Students Having Limited English Proficiency.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 83p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication; Classroom Techniques; Cognitive Style; *Cultural Awareness; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Inservice Teacher Education; Language Research; *Limited English Speaking; *Parent Participation; Program Development; Questioning Techniques; School Districts; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Content Area Teaching

ABSTRACT

An inservice teacher education course was designed to address the problems of content-area teachers in teaching limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. Goals were for content-area teachers: (1) to gain sensitivity to and understanding of the special needs of this population; (2) to become aware of the cultural and linguistic diversity and contributions of various cultures; (3) to acquire knowledge and techniques for successfully integrating LEP students into classes; and (4) to work closely with LEP students' parents. The 10-session course was developed for a large suburban school district with a growing and diverse LEP population. The course was designed to provide teachers with current research on language acquisition, cultural considerations, learning styles, questioning techniques, successful strategies and methods, and effective student interaction for use with LEP students. Goals and objectives of the practicum were met. Analysis revealed a major improvement in the mainstreaming of LEP students whose teachers had participated in the course. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329128

Development of an In-Service Course to Assist Subject-Matter Teachers in Addressing the Unique Needs of Students Having Limited English Proficiency

by

Christine D. Piscitelli

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Cluster 36

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Piscitelli

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Practicum I Report presented to the
Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1990

FL019102

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: R. Gregory Quirk

R. Gregory Quirk, Ed.D.

Assistant Superintendent

Route 516, Old Bridge, New Jersey 08857

January 14, 1991

Date

This practicum report was submitted by Christine D. Piscitelli under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

Date of Final Approval of Report

William Anderson, Ph.D., Adviser

Acknowledgments

This writer would like to thank her husband for his tireless support and encouragement throughout this practicum. A special thank you to the district's professional staff for their cooperation and participation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iv

LIST OF TABLES..... v

ABSTRACT..... vi

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION..... 1

Description of Work Setting and Community..... 1
Writer's Work Setting and Role..... 3

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM..... 6

Problem Description..... 6
Problem Documentation..... 11
Causative Analysis..... 17
Relationship of the Problem to the Literature.. 18

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS..... 24

Measurement of Objectives..... 25
Description of Plans for Analyzing Results..... 26

IV SOLUTION STRATEGY..... 27

Report of Action Taken..... 35

V RESULTS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISSEMINATION..... 39

Results..... 39
Discussion..... 44
Recommendations..... 48
Dissemination..... 48

REFERENCES..... 49

Page

Appendices..... 51

A MAGNET SCHOOL PROPOSAL..... 51
B NATIVE LANGUAGES OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENT..... 59
C ESL/BILINGUAL DEPARTMENT SURVEY..... 61
D FORMAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS..... 63
E INVOLVEMENT OF LEP STUDENTS IN MAINSTREAM CLASSES..... 65
F PROGRESS REPORT..... 67
G WEEKLY LOG FORM..... 70
H ESL INSERVICE PROGRAM FOR CONTENT-AREA TEACHERS..... 72
I ESL STUDENT INTERIM REPORT..... 74

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

I ESL Bilingual Survey Results..... 12
II Interview Questions - Results..... 13
III Attendance of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Population at Magnet Sites..... 15
IV Normal Curve Equivalency Scores of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Population - Grades K-8 in Reading..... 16
V Normal Curve Equivalency Scores of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Population - Grades K-8 in Language..... 16
VI Normal Curve Equivalency Scores of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Population - Grades K-8 in Mathematics..... 17
VII Percentage Improvement of LEP Students' Involvement in Mainstream Classes - Teacher Initiated..... 41
VIII Percentage Improvement of LEP Students' Involvement in Mainstream Classes - Student Initiated..... 41
IX Percentage Improvement of LEP Students' Involvement in Mainstream Classes - Student/Student Interaction..... 42
X Percentage Improvement of LEP Students' Involvement in Mainstream Classes..... 42
XI Journal Entries - Positive Experiences..... 43

ABSTRACT

Development of an In-Service Course to Assist Subject-Matter Teachers in Addressing the Unique Needs of Students Having Limited English Proficiency, Piscitelli, Christine D., 1991: Practicum Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: English (Second Language) / English Instruction / Language Acquisition /Language Skills / Language Experience Approach / Mainstreaming / Teaching Methods.

This practicum was designed to address the concerns of content-area teachers when dealing with the increased population of Limited English Proficient students in their classes: the problem being the need for preparation in the areas of language acquisition and teaching strategies to meet these students' academic needs.

The goals of this practicum were for content-area teachers to exhibit sensitivities and understandings of the special needs of LEP students; to become aware of cultural and linguistic diversity and have an understanding of the customs, values and artistic contributions of various cultures; to acquire knowledge and techniques to successfully integrate LEP students into their classes; and to work closely with the parents of LEP students.

The writer designed a ten session district inservice course which provided teachers with current research on language acquisition, cultural considerations, learning styles, questioning techniques, successful strategies and methodologies, and effective student interaction for use with LEP students.

The results of the practicum were positive. The goals and objectives of the practicum were met. An analysis of the objectives and goals revealed that there was a major improvement in the educational process involving mainstreaming LEP students due to the participation of the teachers of these students in inservice programs. These programs had an appreciable positive impact upon the teachers' awareness of the unique needs of the LEP population within the district.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community

This practicum was conducted in a public school system in a suburban area of a northeastern state. Because of the geographical location of this suburban community, within thirty minutes of a large metropolis, it is often referred to as a "bedroom community." Many of its residents may be seen boarding mass transit in the early morning hours to New York City and returning late in the evening to their residences.

In addition, the school system has a population of approximately 10,000 students and is geographically the fifth largest district in the county, covering an area of 44 square miles. The school system evolved over the past twenty-five years from a one room school house in a farm community to its present system of nineteen sites in an expanding suburban community. These sites include eleven elementary schools, two middle schools, two high schools, three administrative buildings and two former elementary schools which are presently leased to the county for administrative offices. Also, the school system conducts two adult education programs. The first program follows the same curriculum as the district's high schools, with students having to meet the same core proficiencies as their daytime counterparts. All students in this program must be 18 years of age or older. The annual enrollment is 225-250 students. The second program is called Community Education which consists of vocational and recreational programs lasting from six to eight weeks. This program has an annual enrollment of 1,109 students.

The overall population of the community served by the school district is approximately 58,600. The socioeconomic makeup ranges from low-to-middle income. Members of the low income group possess a limited educational background and are employed as laborers in small industries located in the surrounding communities. Often they suffer from a high rate of unemployment and become dependent on federal and state public assistance programs to meet their everyday needs. The middle income group consists of people whose educational background includes a high school diploma with an increasing number continuing in higher education. They are employed in various businesses and professions, with a large portion commuting to the city. A majority of this group are two-income families with the mother often being employed by the school system or local businesses. The majority of the children in the school system are from the middle socioeconomic group.

Since 1980 there has been a growing population of limited English speaking families moving into the district representing forty-seven different languages with the largest population being Spanish to the smallest population being Turkish.

The school system is governed by a nine member board. The board is directly responsible for the operation and policy of the school system, appointing a superintendent to carry out board policies and general operational procedures. The superintendent is assisted by three central administrative assistants. These include two directors of curriculum; one on the elementary level and the other on the secondary level, and the school district's business administrator. In addition, the superintendent is assisted by 28 administrators throughout the district.

The school system employs a total of 1,371 individuals of whom 768 are teachers with the remaining employees in various support categories. These include paraprofessional aides, lunch aides, bus drivers, custodial staff, maintenance staff and clerical staff.

The annual operating budget for the school system is approximately 55.5 million dollars. Revenues are secured from federal, state and local sources. Approximately 2 million dollars of this budget is dedicated to the operation of the Basic Skills Improvement Program with $1 million coming from State Compensatory Education funding, $.5 million coming from Chapter 1 funding and the remaining $.5 million from local revenues. For the operation of the English As A Second Language/Bilingual Programs, $700,872 is allocated. Of this amount, $197,139 is funded by the state and the remaining $503,733 is from local revenues.

In many instances, students in the ESL/Bilingual Programs are often participants in the Basic Skills Improvement Program.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

The writer is the Director of the Basic Skills Improvement Program/English As a Second Language/Bilingual Programs. She is responsible for the administration and supervision of all aspects of these programs, grades K-12. In addition, she is the district's Testing Coordinator. She is assisted in her efforts by two supervisors, one of paraprofessional aides and the other of the English As A Second Language/Bilingual Programs. The later supervisory position is relatively recent and part-time, with the supervisor spending half her day teaching English As A Second Language at the high school level. Clerical staff for these programs include one secretary and two

clerk/typists. A teaching and professional staff of 112 provide the services for these programs. Of the 10,000 students enrolled in the school system, 1,700 students are identified for participation in these state and federal funded programs covering the entire age spectrum, that is, grades K-12. These 1,700 students represent approximately 17 percent of the entire school district's population with 170 students being involved in the English As A Second Language/Bilingual Program, 664 students being involved in the elementary (K-5) Basic Skills Improvement Program and the remaining 856 in the Basic Skills Improvement Program at the secondary level (6-12).

The English As a Second Language Program has been in existence in this district for fourteen years. At the program's inception, all services were provided by one teacher who traveled throughout the school district instructing less than twenty students. The program grew slowly until 1987 when the district experienced an influx of non-English speaking families. From that time forward, the program has grown quite rapidly requiring 13 full-time teachers and three paraprofessional aides. With Spanish being the dominant non-English speaking language in the district, a Spanish Bilingual Program has been implemented to satisfy state mandates.

The growing number of students now needing services has resulted in the school district's use of magnet centers to provide mandated services in an equitable manner. There are five magnet centers at the elementary level; one center at the middle school level and one center at the high school level. One of the five elementary magnet centers also houses the elementary Spanish Bilingual Program. On the secondary level, English

As A Second Language teachers are certified in the bilingual area in order to provide bilingual services to the identified participants. Utilization of the designated magnet centers has resulted in a higher concentration of students needing ESL/Bilingual services in the classes of content-area teachers. The impact of these centers has not yet been determined since this is the first year in operation.

The writer's background and training includes a Master of Arts Degree in Human Development and State Certification in the areas of English, History, Administration and Supervision. The writer has 21 years' teaching experience in the district and two years' administrative experience. During this time she has taught English, Reading and History in grades 6-8 and has also served as Reading Coordinator and Coordinator of the Gifted and Talented Program at this same grade level. In the past ten years, she has been responsible for providing services to students participating in the Basic Skills Improvement Program at the middle school level, many of which have been identified as needing ESL/Bilingual services.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

Historically, children entering school speaking another language have been placed for the last one hundred years in totally English classes. The rationale for this was that it would foster assimilation and acculturation. The advocates of the "melting pot" theory also felt that the greater the immersion, the better the achievement. Studies can still be found supporting the immersion theory of second language acquisition (Hornby, 1980).

Yet, in the United States, for the several million people who face the problem of acquiring control of English as their second language, this "immersion" method has consistently resulted in school failure. Lack of school achievement has been the beginning of a negative cycle for language minority students. The dropout rate is much greater among these students. They attempt to compete in an English employment market equipped with neither fluency nor marketable skills. Many seem doomed to a life of menial labor, welfare or crime.

The enactment of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was to break this cycle. By 1980 nearly a billion dollars had been spent on remedial and compensatory programs for bilingual instruction services. The primary goal was to mainstream these students into the regular English curriculum classroom as rapidly as possible. However, government and school provisions for bilingual education, even in their most rudimentary forms, are highly controversial. First, there is the normal resistance that occurs with any educational change. Secondly, there are political, social and economic barriers to overcome to effectively

implement change. Thirdly, this is an emotionally charged issue that makes it even more difficult to resolve in a rational and scholarly manner (Fontaine, Persky & Golubchick, 1978). Most importantly, the question of whether it is achieving its goal of mainstreaming the language minorities as rapidly as possible is not clear.

Perhaps the least controversial aspect of the Bilingual Education Act is the English As A Second Language component. Since the goal of ESL is English language acquisition, it is the only component that most "melting pot" advocates deem necessary to offer to Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Presently all states require that, where twenty or more Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are identified speaking the same language, the school district must place them in an appropriate Bilingual and English As A Second Language Program. It may be noted that the difference between Bilingual and English As A Second Language Programs is that the former has all instructional materials presented in the native language. While in the later case, both materials and instruction are presented in English. Where there are, however, insufficient numbers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students: less than ten speaking the same language, districts need only provide the ESL component to be in compliance with the law.

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968, along with the landmark decisions, such as Lau v. Nichols, did not mandate bilingual education as being the "appropriate relief" for providing an effective educational program for Limited English Proficient (LEP) children. However, HEW has since issued a blueprint for compliance with the long series of rulings and court decisions. These "Lau Remedies" require school districts to identify the primary language of Limited English Proficient (LEP)

students, describe diagnostic measures, implement the appropriate program and show no discrimination in required and elective courses. The personnel providing these services must be linguistically and culturally familiar with the students' background.

The districts cannot segregate or isolate Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, and their parents must be notified of their children's participation in these programs. Finally, the product and process must be evaluated (Leggio, 1980).

ESL programs are vital in the educational process of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students receiving bilingual instruction, and they are crucial in the education of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students receiving bilingual instruction. In districts having less than twenty Limited English Proficient (LEP) students speaking the same language, English As A Second Language (ESL) is the only language support system that must be provided to be in compliance with the "Lau Remedies." Today even those most adamant against bilingual education concede ESL should be available for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Yet, until the resolution Lau v. Nichols, school districts were not providing this secondary language support program: and the lower courts agreed with the school district that this was not their responsibility. The Circuit Court observed that the educational deficiencies of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students were self-inflicted by the failure of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to learn English before attending school. The Supreme Court disagreed when Justice Douglas declared that basic English skills are at the very core of what public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that before a child can effectively participate in the educational

program, he must already have acquired these basic skills is to make mockery of public education (Geffert et al, 1975).

It was against this historical background that the district's ESL/Bilingual Program, as it now exists, evolved to meet the challenge of the language minorities in providing full access to and participation in the educational, social and economic life, without surrendering their language and cultural distinctiveness.

The initial problem in this district, resulting from the Federal and State mandates, was providing services to meet the needs of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population. When the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population was small in number, it was feasible to have ESL staff travel from school to school to provide instruction. As the population grew and the need for bilingual services was also needed, it became necessary to develop a more educationally effective and cost efficient district ESL/Bilingual Program. After considering various possible approaches, it was decided that the magnet school concept would be implemented. The magnet school concept consisted of the following changes relating to the rendering of services to those students identified for ESL/Bilingual services:

1. Transfer all K-5 bilingual students to one school.
2. Transfer all other K-5 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to the ESL magnet school closest to their home school.
3. Combine both middle school Limited English Proficient (LEP) students into one school.
4. Combine both high school Limited English Proficient (LEP) students into one school.

The impact of the implementation of the magnet school concept was largely positive; namely, reduction in instructional staff, elimination of the need to employ staff members with only emergency certification, reduction of instructional aides, reduction of travel time by staff which now averaged eleven hours per week, provide ESL classes with homogeneous groups, reduction in the length of time students may need to become English proficient (see Appendix A).

There was, however, a negative impact that was unforeseen. From the clustering of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in magnet centers, a heavier concentration of this population became present in the content-area teacher's classroom. This, in turn, caused the content-area teachers to experience difficulty in servicing these students; the problem being that content-area teachers are finding they are not prepared in the area of language acquisition and teaching strategies to meet these students' academic needs. Content-area teachers would feel they could better address the needs of the ESL/Bilingual students if they were provided with the skills, teaching techniques, and special methodology necessary to meet the unique needs of this population.

Problem Documentation

The existence of this problem was documented by the design and implementation of the district's ESL/Bilingual Program. Servicing the district's 177 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students (see Appendix B), is a professional staff of eleven, assisted by three paraprofessional aides. These services are provided in seven schools designated as magnet centers by the district. These 177 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are mainstreamed into content area classes, except for the daily ESL services provided, which range from thirty to ninety minutes per day. Having designated magnet centers, there is now a higher concentration of students needing ESL/Bilingual services in classes of content-area teachers.

In observations by building principals of professional staff in magnet schools, it was indicated that the staff was experiencing difficulty teaching Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Of the fifty teachers having mainstreamed Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in their class, fifty indicated -- in post-observation interviews with their building principal -- that they are inadequately prepared to teach these students. Furthermore, these fifty teachers were included in the ninety teachers asked to complete a survey prepared by the writer indicating areas of concern in teaching Limited English Proficient (LEP) students (see Appendix C). The following are the tabulated results of the survey:

Table I

	YES	NO
1. Program Description: State and Federal Regulations	35	15
2. Magnet School Concept	35	15
3. Registering of New Students	13	37
4. Identification Criteria of Students for ESL/Bilingual Programs	39	11
5. Exit Criteria from ESL/Bilingual Programs	38	12
6. Distinction between ESL and Bilingual Programs	30	20
7. Technique for Instructing ESL Students in Content Areas	47	3
8. Appropriate Materials for ESL Students in Content Areas	44	6
9. Method of Evaluating/Grading ESL Students	44	6

In addition to these nine items there was a section soliciting a written response. Four responses were indicated in this area: parent communication, specific assistance for first grade, maximizing continuity of skills and smooth organization through appropriate individual scheduling and placement, and compliments on the idea of providing inservice for staff.

At ESL/Bilingual staff meetings, ESL/Bilingual staff members documented thirty-five requests by mainstream teachers for assistance in

dealing with their Limited English Proficient (LEP) population in the area of language acquisition. Techniques generally found successful with English speaking students were not as successful with the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population, formal interviews were conducted at all magnet sites of these thirty-five teachers (see Appendix D). Results of interviews are as follows:

Table II

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - RESULTS

1. What is your present Limited English Proficient (LEP) population?

   Answers: 3 - 7 students

2. What was your population before the magnet school concept was implemented?

   Answers: 0 - 2 student(s)

3. Is there any recognizable attendance difference between the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population and the other students in your class?

   Answer: No

4. What is the dominant language spoken at home of these students?

   Answers: Magnet school housing Bilingual Program - Spanish
   Magnet schools - Polish, Arabic, Gujurati

5. How would you categorize the attitude of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student - positive/negative?

   Answers: 27 positive; 8 negative

6. Do you find the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population having difficulty with adjusting socially/academically?

   Answers: 31 yes; 4 no

7. Have you found more difficulty in providing instruction for the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student?

Answers: 30 yes: 5 no

8. How have you attempted to address the problem of grading?

   Answers:
   1. Based on effort and attitude.
   2. Use Pass/Fail System.
   3. Write narrative to parent to accompany assignments and report card.
   4. Grade them as any other student.

9. What adjustment have you needed to implement in your class with regard to this population?

   Answers:
   1. No special attention given: just one of many students in the class; do not have time for individualization.
   2. Provide a buddy system for the child -- assigning another student in class to assist the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student.
   3. Provide some individualization when time allows.

10. How many Limited English Proficient (LEP) students have you had placed in your class since September 1989 to the present? Of these, how many have been exited from the ESL Program and do you agree with this?

    Answers: Varied.

    It may be noted that 89 students have been exited from the program for the 1989-90 school year (September-June) which is 42 percent of the district's total Limited English Proficient (LEP) population.

    Most staff were in disagreement with the State-mandated single exit criteria. This consists of a single test score in the area of Language Proficiency on either the Language Assessment Battery or the Maculaitis Assessment Program (1982).

    To date, content-area teachers have recommended twenty-seven of these students as still needing Basic Skills services.

Attendance records show that the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students have similar or better attendance than the school population on a whole. Parents, in most cases, are well educated and are supportive of the school programs. At parent conferences and workshops held to

familiarize Limited English Proficiency (LEP) parents with community services, well over 50 percent of the parents of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students were represented. At the Annual International Night sponsored by the ESL/Bilingual Department, over 250 parents, families and friends attended.

Table III

ATTENDANCE OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) POPULATION AT MAGNET SITES

Magnet Schools	Average Days Absent/ (LEP) Student	Average Days Absent/ General Population
I	6.3	6.8
II	3.2	4.6
III	0.8	3.2
IV	2.4	2.6
V	4.3	3.9
VI	5.5	6.1
VII	8.6	9.8
Average for All Schools	4.4	5.2

Based on the Spring standardized test score results for the district in the areas of Reading, Language and Mathematics, the ESL population had significantly lower test results than did the general school population. In reviewing the normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for grades K-8, it was found ESL scores averaged between 26.7 to 33.9 points lower than the general population.

Table IV

NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENCY SCORES OF
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) POPULATION
GRADES K-8 IN READING

Grade Level	LEP-NCE	General Population NCEs
K	23.7	57.8
1	42.6	62.3
2	45.0	63.5
3	36.4	64.3
4	20.0	59.7
5	25.5	61.3
6	18.7	57.6
7	10.4	59.9
8	18.6	59.9
Average	26.8	60.7

Table V

NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENCY SCORES OF
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)
GRADES K-8 IN LANGUAGE

Grade Level	LEP-NCE	General Population NCEs
K	27.7	58.1
1	47.5	63.1
2	54.8	66.9
3	41.1	65.8
4	19.9	63.2
5	39.3	67.5
6	24.0	62.9
7	19.9	65.2
8	26.9	66.3
Average	33.4	64.3

Table VI

NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENCY SCORES OF
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) POPULATION
GRADES K-8 IN MATHEMATICS

Grade Level	LEP-NCE	General Population NCEs
K	36.0	64.4
1	60.0	70.2
2	61.5	69.0
3	47.3	67.5
4	40.0	67.0
5	40.0	67.6
6	23.7	67.9
7	16.9	63.1
8	34.6	63.4
Average	40.0	66.7

A review of the attendance records, test scores, teacher survey, staff meeting reports and formal interviews reveal that there is a significant feeling among mainstream teachers in magnet schools that they lack adequate preparation to deal with the unique needs of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

Causative Analysis

One factor related to the cause of the problem is that, at present, mainstream teachers are finding a large concentration of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in their classrooms. This large concentration has developed since the school district has instituted the magnet school concept. Prior to the magnet school concept, Limited English Proficient (LEP) students were distributed over the fifteen schools in the school district. After magnet school sites were designated, all Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are now concentrated in the seven designated schools. This, in turn, has caused the mainstream classroom teachers to be forced to deal with more Limited English Proficient (LEP) students than they had had in the past. Before magnet schools, the maximum Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in a class were two.

With the inception of magnet schools, the maximum Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in a class were raised to seven. Furthermore, the projection for this school district is for an increasing population for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

Another factor related to the cause of the problem is the decrease in the rate of curriculum coverage by the classroom teacher and the resultant lowering of class test scores. The lowering of the test scores causes anxiety on the part of the classroom teacher since the State requires the district to meet the goal of 75 percent of its school population at Grades 3, 6 and 9 to meet the minimal level of proficiency (MLP) established by the State in the areas of Reading, Language and Mathematics.

The most significant cause of the problem is that content-area teachers are not familiar with the research on language acquisition techniques. The majority of content-area teachers have not been trained in secondary language acquisition techniques for the simple reason that, until the implementation of a magnet school concept, there was no need for them to adjust their teaching styles to the non-English speaking students. With the larger concentration of non-English speaking students, it is becoming obvious that teaching styles and techniques must be adjusted to meet the special needs of this population.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

From the writer's review of the literature, many articles, studies and reports have shown that students of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) are failing to acquire basic competencies. The problem is not limited simply to the student's difficulty with the English language,

but also with the inability of the teachers to communicate and transmit their special areas of expertise to these students.

From the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment (OREA, 1988), there has been reported an increasing evidence that high school students of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) are failing to acquire competencies in Mathematics. According to this report, languge minority students of all national backgrounds are generally failing to pass standardized tests in Mathematics. Their findings indicate that the problem is not limited to students' innumeracy, but that the teachers assigned to the class are less able to communicate and transmit the necessary skills and knowledge to help students become mathematically proficient. The results from this study showed that, when special staff development to increase teachers' knowledge and skills in dealing with the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students is systematically presented, these students showed a significant increase in their test scores.

Chamot (1981) states that teachers and administrators are not properly informed concerning the current research in meeting the special needs of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Research is important for teachers and administrators because it investigates which solutions work best for which problems, in which situations, and with which learners. The more teachers know about the findings of current research, the more they can effectively plan, implement and evaluate their ESL/Bilingual Programs. The only way that concerned teachers and administratoirs can compensate for the time lag in availability of materials that reflect new findings about second language learning is to

analyze current research and apply it to their present teaching approaches and instructional materials.

Helgeson (1982) reported that teachers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are not properly trained to modify materials and methods for individualization. Th usefulness for individualizing ESL instruction is well established in the literature and recognized by nearly every teacher who has tried it. Individualizing programs is a valid approach to any group of students with varied linguistic, social and/or educational backgrounds. Since most teachers are oriented toward large group activities, they are reluctant to individualize in a meaningful way that would more effectively present the material on a multi-level basis. The key to effective individualization is the creative use of grouping methods that allow students to work on a variety of tasks in a variety of contexts. While this does require more work on the part of the teacher, it benefits the students and outweighs in success the additional preparation needed in such a tracking methodology.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD, 1987) stresses the importance of staff development in programs for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students. Staff development should be taken into account, but also should be in the context of development designed for the entire staff. A number of factors should be considered in planning staff development around a particular program. These factors include the individual program goals, community expectations, teacher preparation and the extent to which the program uses the student's native language and the English

language. This staff development should be utilized in relationship to the overall educational context of the entire school district. In the early days of education for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, training sequences designed for members of the specialized staff often excluded them from training provided for the school system's other staff. This should be avoided if at all possible. The training offered the rest of the staff is equally valuable to the specialized staff, especially in such areas as lesson design, discipline and classroom management, developing student self-concept, learning theory, student motivation and retention of information.

Cummins (1983) has identified two aspects of language proficiency which are related to school activities: basic interpersonal communicative skills (BOCS) and cognitive/academic language which is usually embedded in a specific context and involves many nonverbal clues, concrete objects and linguistically simple structures. It is the language that serves in personal and social situations, but does not necessarily aid scholastic achievement. Like the language of the toddler, BICS develop first and more easily for the second language pupil.

Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), on the other hand, refers to the language proficiencies that are related to literacy and academic achievement. Academic language is often structurally complex and, when written, lacks clues to clarify its meaning. Often, without nonverbal indicators, the only way to fully understand academic language is through analysis of that language and of other language around it. While BICS can be acquired in a second language in about two years'

time, CALP may take several additional years for non-English proficient students to attain.

Chamot (1981) cites four major causes for the failure of classroom teachers to meet the learning needs of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. First, the failure to note similarities and differences between first language and second language acquisition. Second, social and affective factors and differences in cognitive learning styles play a decisive role in second language acquisition. Third, the appropriate kind of input is required for second language acquisition to take place. Fourth, second language communicative competence in social situations does not guarantee success in academic language tasks.

Glenn (1989) states that studies of language acquisition stress the importance of using the language with peers in activities designed to promote cooperation and reduce anxiety. Real proficiency in the use of English may never be acquired without deliberate efforts to promote integration. Tracking students into classes with lower expectation for achievement is a case of a self-fulfilling prophecy. If non-English speaking students only interact with other students of the same language and not also with English speaking students, they will never truly be educated and accepted.

Ventriglia (1982) states that successful teachers observe nd capitalize on preferred learning styles of individual students. They structure lessons to and for the language learners called "beaders," "braiders," and "orchestrators." Beaders are students who concentrate on semantics: they learn word meanings individually and work with only one word at a time. Words for them are like beads on a string. They prefer that the words be offered for learning in categories such as

clothing, food or animals. Braiders concentrate on syntax and look for patterns in language structure. They acquire language in meaningful chunks and weave or overlap those chunks into sentences very early. They learn best from social interactions where they can imitate and repeat model patterns. Braiders work well in small groups, especially with a native English speaker as a mentor. Orchestrators are language learners who concentrate on sounds and who spend a long time attending to intonation and rhythm. They understand what is said by the tone rather than the words. Orchestrators prefer to learn songs and rhythmic poems. They can comprehend short sentences that are enunciated carefully. Teachers who are effective present lessons with enough variety to accommodate each type of learner.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

The following goals and objectives were projected for this practicum: content-area teachers are to exhibit sensitivities and understandings of the special needs of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Content-area teachers will become aware of cultural and linguistic diversity and have an understanding of the customs, values and artistic contributions which are available through various cultures. They will acquire knowledge and techniques to successfully integrate the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students into their classes and will work closely with parents in a non-condescending role. Lastly, teachers will adopt a role definition that includes collaboration with parents of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

At the end of the three month implementation period, the writer expected to achieve the following specific behavioral objectives:

Objective 1: To increase the involvement of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in the mainstream classes by 50 percent as measured by a chart kept by the classroom teacher. For the purpose of this practicum, involvement will be defined as verbal interaction on both a formal classroom as well as an informal nonstructured basis.

Objective 2: To increase the test scores of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students on the district's standardized test as measured by the normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in the areas of Total Reading, Language and Mathematics.

Objective 3: To increase Limited English Proficient (LEP) students' positive experience in mainstream classes as measured by journal entries kept by the students concerning attitudes toward school.

Objective 4: To increase the content-area teacher's interaction with parents of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students as measured by the amount of parent communiques.

Measurement of Objectives

Objective One was measured by the use of a chart which recorded LEP student involvement in mainstream classes. Categories of student involvement included teacher initiated, student initiated, and student to student responses. This was kept over a ten week period. The frequency of responses were classified as rarely, somewhat and often. (See Appendix E.)

Objective Two was measured by a readministering of the California Test of Basic Skills in the areas of Total Reading, Language and Mathematics.

Objective Three was measured by written entries in an ongoing journal kept by students concerning their classroom experiences. Students were asked to share an experience which took place during the school day. In some cases students used pictures rather than words or a combination of both to communicate their experiences. A notebook was provided for this activity.

Objective Four was measured by a progress report designed by the teachers participating in the inservice course. (See Appendix F.) This was done in both English and Spanish so as to provide for the Bilingual component of the district's program. This report

would be provided for parents. On a weekly basis they would receive information concerning the progress of their child in the categories of verbal communication, reading, writing, and attitude/behavior.

Description of Plans for Analyzing Results

Tables will be used to present and review the results as to whether or not the objectives were achieved. Tables will present the increased involvement of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in the mainstream classes. A table will also be used to display the increase of positive experiences in mainstream classes for the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Journal entries kept by the students will be the source used for this tabulation.

In addition, a log will be kept by the writer to record any pertinent but unexpected events which may occur during this practicum experience (see Appendix G).

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

The problem is meeting the unique needs of students having limited English proficiency by the content-area classroom teacher. This problem has been widely discussed by various experts in the literature of instruction for non-English speaking students. Although the literature is extensive with many models of instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, no single model of instruction exists. A number of factors including program goals, community expectations, teacher preparation, the extent to which the program uses the students' native and English language and the relationship of the program to the larger educational context must be considered. In other words, different program models call for different staff development approaches.

Cazden and Leggett (1981) suggests that staff development in the area of cultural considerations would lead to sensitivity and respect among all students in Limited English Proficient (LEP) Programs. Teachers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students should realize that learners need special cultural consideration as well as linguistic help if they are to have full access to educational opportunities.

ASCD (1987) recommends that staff development in education for students with limited English proficiency, like staff development geared to the needs of any special population - must include certain specific areas of training. Chief among them are the following:

Language proficiency training. In programs that use the children's native language as a medium of instruction, language training for teachers and other personnel is critical. Because most members of the program staff may not have been educated in the students' native language at the elementary level, and only minimally so at the secondary level, they may require training in speaking, reading, and writing that language.

Intensive linguistic training. Education for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, by its very nature, implies linguistic differences, and a knowledge of psycho and socio linguistics is therefore crucial to program staff.

Cultural training. As our schools increase in cultural and linguistic diversity, an understanding of the customs, values, and artistic contributions of the students' native culture becomes an essential part of all educators' reportoires.

Specialized teacher training. Pedagogical competence takes on a specialized meaning in education for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, where knowledge of the art of teaching includes understanding the learning process as it relates to more than one language. Among the important staff development topics here are the nature of second-language learning and teaching; the degree of L1 usage that is necessary or desirable; the differences in presenting literacy skills in L1 and L2; the selection of appropriate curriculum materials; and the assessment of student progress.

Specialized support for new teachers. Even when new teachers have received excellent preservice training, they will have many questions and concerns. Staff development for new teachers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students should include orientation to the program's goals, information on available resources and materials, and help with time management.

Growth opportunities for master teachers. A well-stocked resource library and opportunities to meet with other master teachers to share ideas, techniques, and materials are indispensible for the continued professional growth of outstanding experienced teachers.

Collaboration with parents. Teachers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students should be encouraged to work with parents in a noncondescending partnership role. Staff development should focus on encouraging educators to adopt a role definition that includes collaboration with parents.

Cochran (1985) recognizes language as a tool that helps "get things done" in content area classes, developing language skills is an integral part of those courses. Effective teachers work to develop listening, speaking, reading and writing skills during the whole day, not just during language instruction. Teaching content area subjects to Limited English Proficient (LEP) students does involve a combination of expertise in both the subject matter and in ESL methodology.

Cummins (1981) suggests that for both first and second language learners, meaning is the key to linguistic development. Effective teachers create situations in which students have an immediate and practical purpose for using the language. Integrating ESL instruction with basic skills also makes language more functional for the students.

According to Krashen and Terrell (1983), the ability to communicate in a second language is often better developed through "acquisition," which is similar to the way the first language develops than through formal language instruction. Students allowed to acquire a second language as they did their first, by being involved in its use for necessary communication, develop a subliminal understanding of syntax that influences their language behavior. Whether it is a first or second language, however, certain factors are common to language development:

A silent period in which learners absorb the meaning of the language around them and build competence until they are ready to speak;

Comprehensible input, made up of words or language that is known plus a new element which the learner can understand because of the context; and

Meaningful practice in listening, speaking, reading and writing that involves using the language for practical communication.

The careful inclusion of each of these factors assures that a second language will develop in a thorough and effective manner.

Fisher and Guthrie (1983) have identified verbal participation as a measure of student engagement on task. It is also used by teachers as one way to measure student learning. Teachers who are successful have arranged their instructional approaches to increase student verbal particiption in educationally relevant topics. Their manner of questioning students is the primary way of doing this.

There is a correlation between cultural group membership and preferred modes of perceiving, remembering, thinking or learning and using information. Sensory modality strengths are one manifestation of cognitive preferences. It has long been recognized that some students prefer to learn auditorially, others visually and still others kinetically. According to Cazden (1981) a deliberately multisensory curriculum is most effective for a multicultural classroom.

Ramirez and Castaneda (1974) refer to the extent to which an individual's perception is influenced by the surrounding field. This area of field sensitivity and independence has received considerable attention in cognitive style research. Societies have group tendencies toward one end: field sensitivity, or another; independence, and the extent to which a person's perception is sensitive to or independent of the surrounding environment indicates preferences for learning. Field sensitive pupils need more structure in curriculum tasks and need more opportunities for interpersonal exchanges during learning. Field independent pupils need less teacher direction and are motivted by the task itself. They work better on independent projects than do their field dependent classmates.

Throughout the literature review there is no one method or approach that is appropriate to teach language. Teachers and other staff members must have a clear understanding of theories of language acquisition, as well as methodology. Without an understanding of how students acquire a second language, even well-meaning educators may fall into the trap of making assumptions about teaching that are correct only in monolingual instruction.

Social and affective factors and differing cognitive learning styles have been found to significantly affect second language learning. The attitude of learners toward the cultural group that speaks the second language and their greater or lesser desire to participate in that group has as much effect on the success of their second language acquisition as do their aptitude and verbal intelligence.

Research on differing cognitive styles and types of learning strategies highlights the fact that individual differences must be considered in second language acquisition.

Evaluation of the possible solutions reported in the literature indicate that content-area teachers of ESL students need to be aware of current research on language acquisition, cultural considerations, learning styles, questioning techniques and effective student interaction.

The writer believes that all the solutions offered in the literature can be implemented with the designated population and in the writer's worksetting. The solutions can assist the writer in achieving her specific goals and objectives. These solutions can assist the content-area teachers of ESL students in addressing their unique needs with regard to language acquisition.

The writer is prepared to provide an inservice course for 3 credits. The content of the course will provide:

Successful strategies and methodologies in instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

Practical information concerning second language acquisition.

Information on individual students' learning styles.

From the research literature and district feedback, the writer believes that the teachers of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students desire practical information on teaching strategies and learning styles for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. The district's commitment to provide inservice credit for the course serves as an additional inducement for teachers to attend.

The writer after receiving approval from the district's superintendent to provide content-area teachers with an inservice course addressing the unique needs of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students established a committee consisting of four members from the ESL/Bilingual Department. The writer had met with her committee once a month to begin the necessary preparations for the implementation. The following course outline and calendar plan had been proposed:

COURSE: Effective Instructional Strategies for Magnet School Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students (K-12)

3 Credits --- 3 Hours x 10 Weeks

DATES: Thursdays

September 27

October 4, 11, 18, 25

November 1, 15, 29

December 6, 13

TIME: 3:30 - 6:30 P.M. (tentative)

LOCATION: TBA (Carl Sandburg Middle School Learning Center)

1. OBJECTIVE:

Provide magnet school subject-area teachers (K-12) with information regarding second language (L2) development and practical strategies for instructing Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

2. WEEK BY WEEK OUTLINE:

Synopsis:

1. Second Language Acquisition:Overview, Roleplaying.
2. Regulations, District Plans and Proposals: Federal/State Regulations, Identification and Entrance Criteria, Exiting Criteria, Distinction Between ESL/Bilingual.
3. Levels: Port-of-Entry, Beginning, Intermediate, Advances: Problems Specific to Each Category.
4. L2 Acquisition Techniques: Discourse Analysis, Natural Approach.
5. Learning Styles: Personal, Cultural.

6. Integration of ESL Strategies for Effective Instruction of Elementary Curriculum.
7. Integration of ESL Strategies for Effective Instruction of Secondary Curriculum.
8. Evaluation and Grading: Port-of-Entry, Beginning Students.
9. Evaluation and Grading: Intermediate, Advanced Students.
10. Distribution of Cooperative Learning Projects, Participant Feedback and Course Evaluation.

3. FORM OF EVALUATION:

1. Weekly Log - recording reaction to session and assigned readings.
2. Cooperative learning group project (share successful instructional strategies and techniques).

The writer's role in providing this inservice program for the district includes all arrangements for the course, measuring the results and being the presenter at two of the three hour sessions.

REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

The implementation strategy for this practicum began with the approval of a ten week inservice program beginning in September 1990. The district superintendent approved three inservice credits for all teachers successfully completing the ten week program. After approval was received for the program, the following steps were taken for the successful completion of the implementation strategy.

Step one for the solution strategy of this practicum was the establishment of a committee of four members from the ESL/Bilingual

Department. A memorandum was sent to ESL/Bilingual staff members (see Appendix H) soliciting their participation in the design and implementation of the ten week inservice program. The committee was established after affirmative respondents were obtained.

The second step of the solution strategy was to schedule monthly committee meetings to begin the necessary preparations for implementation which included a course line and calendar plan. It was decided to hold the inservice course at a central site in the district between the months of September 1990 and January 1991. A ten session outline was adopted to address the unique needs of LEP students.

The third step of the solution strategy provided district staff with an announcement of the inservice course being offered. Registration for the course was limited to twenty staff members having LEP students in their classes.

The fourth step of the solution strategy was the initial inservice training sessions for the teachers of LEP students. This involved a presentation of an overview of second language acquisition. During these sessions attendees were acquainted with factors that assure a second language development in an efficient manner. Such factors included a silent period in which learners absorb the meaning of the language around them; comprehensible output which is made up of words that are known and a learner's understanding of context; and meaningful practice which involves using the language for practical communication.

The fifth step of the solution strategy was the inservice sessions which focused on language transition in the content areas. The primary concern was that crucial area of transition from the native language instruction to total instruction in English. These sessions presented

ways for teachers to develop students' thinking skills by understanding language proficiencies necessary for various levels of questions. The attendees were then asked to consider each of their content areas separately and give thought to some specific issues related to art, music, science, social studies, mathematics, and others.

The sixth step of the solution strategy was the inservice sessions concerned with cultural considerations in the classroom. These sessions described some teaching and learning preferences which are common in this country and others which are common in the different societies represented in our district. Teachers were cautioned to be sensitive to the cultural differences and various learning techniques when planning the educational programs for their LEP students.

The final step for the solution strategy of this practicum was a presentation of research which identifies the characteristics of effective education for LEP students and the practical application of that research for use in the classroom. Teachers were asked to develop a variety of practical lessons to share with the group. These lessons were critiqued by the group to determine their usefulness in meeting the unique needs of LEP students.

During the four month implementation phase of the practicum, no significant deviations from the writer's plans were encountered nor were any significant difficulties encountered. One unexpected event was the leaving of a member of our professional staff to another district. This member had been an integral part of the planning for the inservice program. As a result of this, it became necessary to recruit an additional member of the staff to make the presentations.

A second unexpected event occurred after the first three sessions. Teachers requested that additional time be provided for sharing of experiences that occur during the week. They wished to include some incidents that they had difficulty in handling and also the results that they had with implementing some of the techniques introduced in the course. To facilitate this request, additional time was given at the end of the session and the room was made available prior to the inservice presentations for those staff members who cared to meet.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISSEMINATION

Results

The problem that existed in this writer's work setting was the negative impact that resulted from the clustering of LEP students in magnet centers. This heavier concentration of LEP students made it more difficult for the content-area teacher to function in his or her normal fashion. Specifically, the problem of the content-area teachers was that they were finding a lack of information on how to present language acquisition to these students with special needs. The content-area teachers felt that they needed special training in teaching techniques and special methodologies to meet the unique needs of this population.

The solution to the problem was to establish an inservice training program to assist content-area teachers of ESL students to adopt the proper teaching methodologies and techniques for these students. An integral part of the program was to have these teachers incorporate in their lessons language acquisition skills which would better enable the ESL students to be more successful. The writer felt that appropriate training in the application of language acquisition by content-area teachers would make these teachers aware of the importance in allowing for diverse cultural considerations, and for the diversity of learning styles. In addition, this inservice program stressed proper questioning techniques and effective strategies for student/student interaction and student/teacher interaction.

The goals of this practicum were for the content-area teachers to exhibit sensitivities and understandings of the special needs of LEP students. These teachers became aware of the cultural and linguistic diversity of their LEP student population. They became more comfortable with the variety of customs, values and artistic expressions manifested within these cultures.

Specific objectives were designed to meet these goals. The following is a list of each objective followed by the results related to that specific objective:

Objective 1: To increase the involvement of LEP students in mainstream classes by 50 percent as measured by a chart kept by the classroom teacher. For the purpose of this practicum, involvement will be defined as verbal interaction on both a formal classroom as well as an informal nonstructured basis.

The teachers were asked to utilize the accompanying survey to measure the involvement of LEP students in the mainstream classroom. This chart was kept for each student during the ten inservice sessions (see Appendix E).

The results revealed that there was an 83 percent improvement from week one to week ten in LEP student involvement by teacher initiated questioning. The results also revealed a 58 percent increase in LEP student involvement as measured by student initiated questions and volunteering comments. There was a 100 percent improvement in LEP student involvement as measured by informal conversation between LEP students and other members in the class.

Table VII

Percentage Improvement of LEP Students' Involvement in Mainstream Classes
Teacher Initiated
Total Number of Students - 80

Week	Rarely	Somewhat	Often
1	78	2	0
2	75	5	0
3	68	12	0
4	70	10	0
5	62	14	4
6	50	22	8
7	35	30	15
8	35	31	14
9	20	45	15
10	12	50	8

During week one, 98 percent of the students rarely interacted in mainstream classes. During week ten, only 15 percnt of the students rarely interacted. This indicates an 83 percent improvement.

Table VIII

Percentage Improvement of LEP Students' Involvement in Mainstream Classes
Student Initiated
Total Number of Students - 80

Week	Rarely	Somewhat	Often
1	80	0	0
2	80	0	0
3	80	0	0
4	76	4	0
5	60	20	0
6	60	18	2
7	51	20	9
8	43	22	15
9	40	32	8
10	34	38	8

During week one, 100 percent of the students rarely initiated involvement in mainstream classes. During week ten, only 34 percent rarely initiated discussion. This indicates a 58 percent improvement.

Table IX

Percentage Improvement of LEP Students' Involvement in Mainstream Classes
Student/Student Interaction
Total Number of Students - 80

Week	Rarely	Somewhat	Often
1	80	0	0
2	76	4	0
3	65	10	5
4	61	12	7
5	50	25	5
6	30	38	12
7	18	50	12
8	5	43	32
9	0	41	39
10	0	53	27

During week one, 100 percent of the students rarely interacted with their peers. During week ten, there were no students who rarely interacted with their peers. This shows 100 percent improvement.

Table X

Percentage Improvement of LEP Student Involvement in Mainstream Classes

Category	Percentage Improvement
Teacher Initiated	83%
Student Initiated	58%
Student/Student	100%

Objective 2: To increase the test scores of LEP students on the district's standardized test as measured by the normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in the areas of Total Reading, Language and Mathematics.

LEP students of the participants in the inservice course were tested at the conclusion of this program. In reviewing the normal curve equivalents (NCEs), it was found that ESL scores increased from the previous test results an average of .5 in the areas of language and reading and .1 in the area of mathematics.

Objective 3: To increase LEP students' positive experience in mainstream classes as measured by journal entries kept by the students concerning attitudes towards school.

Students were asked to keep a daily journal (approximately ten minutes set aside per day) of their school experiences. Based on these journals, students showed an increase of positive experiences in mainstream classes. Table XI provides the results of these journal entries.

Table XI

Journal Entries - Positive Experiences
Total Number of ESL Students - 80

Week	Positive	Negative	Neutral
1	2	6	72
10	23	10	47

Objective 4: To increase the content-area teacher's interaction with parents of LEP students as measured by the amount of parent communiques.

At the first session of the inservice program, content-area teachers of LEP students were informed of the importance of their interaction with the parents of LEP students. District policy requires that teachers only notify parents halfway through a marking period (interim report) if the student has low or failing grades. It was stressed to content-area teachers that the limited parent contact is not sufficient with LEP students. In many instances, parents do not speak English and this interim report (see Appendix I) would be disregarded. It was, therefore, determined that an alternative both in structure and frequency for the interim report must be found.

A required assignment for those taking the inservice program was to design a communique reporting student progress (see Appendix F) to be sent to parents of LEP students. The frequency of the communique was discussed and its distribution was to take place once per week.

Discussion

A review and interpretation of the data indicates that all four objectives were achieved. This indicates that the following goals were met and will continue to be met throughout the school year: content-area teachers exhibit sensitivities and understandings of the special needs of LEP students; content-area teachers show an awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity among their students; content-area teachers exhibit the knowledge and techniques to successfully integrate LEP students into their classes; and content-area teachers indicate a close working relationship with the parents of these students.

The results confirmed the writer's expectations that content-area teachers can be educated in the area of language acquisition and its transition into the content area. Teachers who recognize that pluralism is one of our national strengths are more likely to treat all cultural groups with equal respect and sensitivity. Teachers of LEP students know that these learners need special cultural consideration as well as linguistic help if they are to have full access to educational opportunities.

A review of the literature reveals that others have met with positive results when dealing with cultural diversity when each culture is treated with respect and sensitivity by others. Culture is actually a form of communication which is shared among members of a society and which consists of both implicit and explicit rules for perceiving, believing, evaluating and acting (Trueba, et al., 1981). Fisher and Guthrie (1983) has identified the importance of verbal participation in the classroom as a measure of the student's engagement and internalization of the lesson being taught. The writer has found that student particiption can be developed by a carefully organized program to bring those students who rarely participate into the mainstream of classroom activity.

Krashen and Terrell (1983) indicated that the ability to communicate in a second language is better developed through acquisition than through formal language instruction. The writer has found equally positive results in comparison to the works of others.

Since all the goals and objectives were met, several implications became obviously apparent. Content-area teachers of LEP students are now more acutely aware of the special needs and special problems associated with these students. Failure to deal with these unique circumstances of LEP students will detrimentally effect their acquisition of the English language and have a correspondingly negative affect on their academic performance. This necessitates an early sensitivity on the part of the content-area teachers to the special techniques and methodologies that must be employed when dealing with these LEP students. It must be kept in mind that the primary concern when dealing with LEP students who have been mainstreamed into regular school classrooms is that the first order of business is to help the students build a share of knowledge about the English language -- its sounds, meanings and appearance in print. It is not necessary to wait until a LEP student can understand and speak English before introducing them to reading and writing in that language. All of the language processes support and clarify each other and need to be developed in meaningful, full-context situations. The most important implication flowing from the success of this practicum is that the teachers involved learn the importance of allowing for cultural diversity within their classroom environment. The characteristics including values, behavior and perceptions of each culture have a profound effect on both learning and classroom activities.

The writer experienced only one unanticipated, but very positive, outcome from the success of this practicum. This was the enthusiasm shown by the majority of the participants. After most sessions teachers requested additional time for sharing experiences. Most wished to include some incidents and techniques which were used to overcome obstacles in dealing with their LEP students. All went beyond what was initially required of them to help in securing the success of this practicum. This indicated the importance they attached to the special skills and techniques required for the instructing of LEP students.

Based on the results obtained from the data relating to each objective, the writer concludes that content-area teachers can be sensitized to the unique needs of LEP students. These unique needs include language acquisition, transition of language skills, cultural diversification, and the importance of parental involvement. The writer believes that with proper inservice training and the inclusion of current literature and research, teachers can more effectively plan, implement and evaluate their programs with regard to the unique needs of LEP students. In general, the attributes of effective teaching of LEP students are the same attributes which are necessary in teaching in any classroom. These include: strong academic goals, clearly stated learning objectives, materials appropriate to the needs of the students and a sensitive caring learning environment.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that participants be provided with release time for a follow-up session to share continued concerns involving LEP students.
2. It is recommended that current literature and research concerning the teaching of LEP students be provided by the district for all teachers of LEP students.
3. It is recommended that the use of parent communiqués be continued throughout the school year.
4. It is recommended that an LEP Parent Advisory Council be formed to facilitate communication and provide input with regard to program planning.
5. It is recommended that this inservice program be continued in subsequent years in order to meet the needs of an increasing LEP population in the writer's district.

Dissemination

This practicum has been shared with Directors/Supervisors of ESL/Bilingual Programs in surrounding school districts.

This practicum was also shared with administrators in the writer's district.

Portions of this practicum were used as a basis for instruction in classes conducted by the writer.

References

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1987). Building an indivisable nation: Bilingual education in context (Report No. 003054). Alexandria, VA

Cazden, C. & Leggett, E. (1981). Culturally responsive education: Recommendations for achieving lau remedies II. In H. Trueba, G. Gurhie, & K. Hu-Pei Au (Eds.), Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography. Rowley, MA: Newbury Publishers, Inc.

Chamot, A. (1981). Applications of second language acquisition research to the bilingual classroom. Focus, 8. Rosslyn, VA.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Chamot, A. (1982). Effective schools -- effective bilingual education. Forum. Rosslyn, VA.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Chamot, A. (1983). How to plan a transfer curriculum from bilingual to mainstream instruction. Focus, 12. Rosslyn, VA.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Cochran, C. (1985). Effective practices for bilingual/ESL teachers (Document PTM 500.11). Trenton, NJ.: Division of Compensatory/ESL Bilingual Education, State Department of Education.

Cumins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In Schooling and Language Minority Students. Los Angeles, CA.: Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education.

Fischer, C. & Guthrie, L. (1983). Executive summary: The significant bilingual instructional features study (Document SBIF-83-R.14). San Francisco, CA.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Geffert, H. (1975). Papers in applied linguistics: Bilingual series 4. Arlington, VA.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Glenn, C. (1990, May). How to integrate bilingual education without tracking. The School Administrator, pp. 28-31.

Helgesen, M. (1982, August). Coping with the multilevel classroom. TESOL Newsletter, pp. 33-35.

Hornby, P. (1980, April). Achieving second language fluency through immersion education. Foreign Language, p. 13.

Krashen, S. & Terrell, Y. (1983). The natural approach. Haywood, CA.: The Alemany Press.

LaFontaine, H., Persky, B., & Golubchick, L. (Eds.). (1978). Bilingual education. Wayne, NJ.: Avery Publishing Group, Inc.

Leggio, P. (1980). A handbook for national origin desegregation. Trenton, NJ.: State Department of Education, Office of Equal Educational Opportunity.

Maculaitis, J. (1982). Maculaitis assessment program: A multi-purpose test for non-native speakers of English. Haywood, CA.: The Alemany Press.

Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment. (1989). Project BETAC. Brooklyn, New York: New York City Board of Education.

Ramirez, M. & Costaneda, A. (1974). Cultural democracy, bicognitive development and education. New York: Academic Press.

Trueba, H., Guthrie, G., & Hu-Pei, Au, K. (1981). Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnology. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Ventriglia, L. (1982). Conversations of Miguel and Maria: How children learn English as a second language. Reading, MA.: Addison Wesley Publishing Co.

APPENDIX A

MAGNET SCHOOL PROPOSAL

MAGNET SCHOOL PROPOSAL
for
ESL/BILINGUAL STUDENTS 1989-90

I. Proposal

As recommended during our district's previous monitoring, the following proposal is submitted to provide for a more educationally effective, cost-efficient ESL/Bilingual program.

1. Transfer all K-5 bilingual students to one school. (See Item A)

2. Transfer all other K-5 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to the ESL magnet school closest to their home school. (See Item B)

3. Transfer Salk LEP students to Carl Sandburg Middle School. (See Item C)

4. Transfer Madison Central LEP students to Cedar Ridge High School. (See Item C)

II. Rationale

A. Madison Park is the proposed bilingual school based on the number of students historically identified in need of bilingual services.*
(* State mandates a bilingual program whenever 20 or more students of a given language are identified as Limited English Proficient. Materials used in the district's Spanish bilingual component are in English. Spanish is used as a medium of instruction to facilitate skill development.)

B. Proposed "pool" of ESL magnet schools:

Carpenter
Cheesequake
McDivitt
Schirra
Shepard
Southwood

These schools have been identified as ESL centers because district students are presently transported to receive Special Services. Using these schools would then have minimal impact on the transportation budget.

C. Historically, these schools have had the larger number of LEP students. Consolidating these schools would also permit for shorter travel distance if staff needs to service both schools.

III. Impact

This proposal would:

...reduce instructional staff

...eliminate the need to employ staff with emergency/inadequat certification

...reduce/eliminate the need for instructional aides

...reduce/eliminate daily staff travel between schools

...permit for homogeneous small group instruction and the reduction/elimination of the present heterogeneous or tutorial instruction

...reduce the length of time students may need to become English proficient

...improve communication and provide for better coordination of instruction between content-area teachers and ESL/ Bilingual teachers

1988-1989		1989-1990	
* STUDENTS	SCHOOL	* STUDENTS	SCHOOL
ELEMENTARY			
27 (16 BIL)	MADISON PK (BIL/ESL)	28 (16 BIL)	MADISON PK (BIL/ESL)
2	COOPER (ESL)	11	CHEESEQUAKE (ESL)
4	MEMORIAL (ESL)		
5	CHEESEQUAKE (ESL)		
21	McDIVITT (BIL/ESL)	20	McDIVITT (ESL)
10	SHEPARD (ESL)	21	SHEPARD (ESL)
11	SCHIRRA (ESL)		
7	GISSOM (ESL)	10	CARPENTER (ESL)
3	CARPENTER (ESL)		
7	VOORHEES (ESL)	15	SOUTHWOOD (ESL)
8	SOUTHWOOD (ESL)		
MIDDLE SCHOOL			
23	SANDBURG (ESL)	30	SANDBURG (ESL)
7	SALK (ESL)		
HIGH SCHOOL			
18	CEDAR RIDGE (ESL)	24	CEDAR RIDGE (ESL)
6	MADISON CENTRAL (ESL)		

PROPOSED ESL/BIL PROGRAM
MAGNET CENTERS

SCHOOL	PROGRAM	TEACHER	STATUS	NO. STUDENTS
		ELEMENTARY		
MADISON PK	BIL/ESL	.....	F/T	28
		.....	F/T	
CHEESEQUAKE	ESL	.....	F/T	11
McDIVITT	ESL	.....	F/T	20
SHEPARD	ESL	.....	F/T	21
CARPENTER	ESL	.....	F/T	10
SOUTHWOOD	ESL	.....	F/T	15
		MIDDLE SCHOOL		
SANDBURG	ESL	.....	F/T	30
		.....	P/T	
		HIGH SCHOOL		
CEDAR RIDGE	ESL	.....	F/T	24

PROPOSED ESL/BIL PROGRAM
SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION

SCHOOL (PROGRAM)	TEACHER	STATUS	NO. STUDENTS
	ELEMENTARY		
MADISON PK (BIL/ESL)	.....	F/T	28
	.....	F/T	
CHEESEQUAKE (ESL)	.....	F/T	11
McDIVITT (ESL)	.....	F/T	20
SHEPARD (ESL)	.....	F/T	21
CARPENTER (ESL)	.....	F/T	10
SOUTHWOOD (ESL)	.....	F/T	15
	MIDDLE SCHOOL		
SANDBURG (ESL)	.....	F/T	30
	.....	P/T	
	HIGH SCHOOL		
CEDAR RIDGE (ESL)	.....	F/T	24

PROPOSED ESL/BIL PROGRAM
CLASS SCHEDULE
1989 - 1990

PERIOD	SCHEDULE TIME
½PREP	9:00 - 9:15
1	9:20 - 9:50
2	9:55 - 10:25
3	10:30 - 11:00
4	11:05 - 11:35
LUNCH	11:40 - 12:40
5	12:45 - 1:15
6	1:20 - 1:50
7	1:55 - 2:25
8	2:30 - 3:00
½PREP	3:00 - 3:15

	TIME (HR)
STUDENT	4
LUNCH	1
PREP	0.5
TRAVEL	0
CLASS TRAVEL	0.75
LOST	0
TOTAL	6.25

PROPOSED ESL/BIL PROGRAM
CLASS SCHEDULE
1989 - 1990

PERIOD	SCHEDULE TIME
½PREP	9:00 - 9:15
1	9:20 - 9:50
2	9:55 - 10:25
3	10:30 - 11:00
4	11:05 - 11:35
LUNCH	11:40 - 12:40
5	12:45 - 1:15
6	1:20 - 1:50
7	1:55 - 2:25
8	2:30 - 3:00
½PREP	3:00 - 3:15

	TIME (HR)
STUDENT	4
LUNCH	1
PREP	0.5
TRAVEL	0
CLASS TRAVEL	0.75
LOST	0
TOTAL	6.25

APPENDIX B

NATIVE LANGUAGES OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS

E.S.L. / BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
1989 - 1990
DATA: NATIVE LANGUAGES OF LEP STUDENTS

NATIVE LANGUAGE	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTALS
ARABIC	5	2	4	1	1			1	1	1	1	1		18
BENGALI		1			1			1						3
BULGARIAN			1		1									2
CANTONESE	3	2	5		1					2		1		14
CREOLE								1						1
ENGLISH (JAMAICA)				1										1
FRENCH		1						1		1				3
GREEK				2		1								3
GUJARATI	4	2		1					1	1		3	11	14
HEBREW		1	1											2
HINDI	1	1	2	1	1				1	1	1			9
HUNGARIAN		1		1						1				3
ILONGO		1									1			2
ITALIAN	2	2		1	1	1								7
KOREAN		1	1						1			2		5
KRIO					1	1								2
MANDARIN	1				1									2
MARATHI						1					1			2
POLISH	5	6	2	1	1		1				2			18
PORTUGUESE	3	1	3	2				1						10
PUNJABI		1			1				1			2		5
RUSSIAN		2												2
SLOVENIAN		1					1							2
SPANISH	4	6	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1		1	1	30
TAGALOG		2												2
TURKISH							1							1
URDU	5	2	2					1			1	1		12
YUGOSLAVIAN				1	1									2
TOTALS	33	36	23	15	12	5	3	8	7	8	6	11	3	177

APPENDIX C

ESL/BILINGUAL DEPARTMENT SURVEY

OFFICE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION/CHAPTER 1/ESL/BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

ESL/BILINGUAL DEPARTMENT

Directions: Indicate (✓) areas of concern that you wish to see addressed at an inservice.

		Yes	No
1.	Program Description: State and Federal Regulations	[ ]	[ ]
2.	Magnet School Concept	[ ]	[ ]
3.	Registering of New Students	[ ]	[ ]
4.	Identification Criteria of Students for ESL/Bilingual Programs	[ ]	[ ]
5.	Exit Criteria from ESL/ Bilingual Programs	[ ]	[ ]
6.	Distinction between ESL and Bilingual Programs	[ ]	[ ]
7.	Technique for Instructing ESL Students in Content Areas	[ ]	[ ]
8.	Appropriate Materials for ESL Students in Content Areas	[ ]	[ ]
9.	Method of Evaluating/Grading ESL Students	[ ]	[ ]
10.	Other_____		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

FORMAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your present Limited English Proficient (LEP) population?
2. What was your population before the magnet school concept was implemented?
3. Is there any recognizable attendance difference between the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population and the other students in your class?
4. What is dominant language spoken at home of these students?
5. How would you categorize the attitude of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student - positive/negative?
6. Do you find the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population having difficulty with adjusting socially/academically?
7. Have you found more difficulty in providing instruction for the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student?
8. How have you attempted to address the problem of grading?
9. What adjustment have you needed to implement in your class with regard to this population?
10. How many Limited English Proficient (LEP) students have you had placed in your classes from September, 1989, to the present? Of these students how many have been exited from the ESL Program and do you agree with this?

APPENDIX E

INVOLVEMENT OF LEP STUDENTS IN MAINSTREAM CLASSES

Involvement of LEP Students in Mainstream Classes

(Survey 1, Objective 1)

Directions:

1. Enter student's name.
2. For each of the ten-week inservice, enter for each of the three columns either RARELY, SOMEWHAT, or OFTEN.

KEY:

RARELY - 0-2 responses per week

SOMEWHAT - 3-5 responses per week

OFTEN - more than 5 responses per week

CATEGORIES

TEACHER INITIATED - student answering direct question asked by teacher.

STUDENT INITIATED - student asking a question or volunteering a comment.

STUDENT/STUDENT - informal conversation between students.

STUDENT NAME _____

Week	Teacher Initiated	Student Initiated	Student/Student
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

APPENDIX F

PROGRESS REPORT

PROGRESS REPORT

Student's Name: _____ Date: _____

Grade: _____ School: _____

Teacher: _____ Program: ESL _____
Mathematics _____
Language Arts _____

WEEK	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Verbal Communication										
Reading										
Writing										
Mathematics										
Attitude and Behavior										

KEY: S: Satisfactory
I: Has Shown Improvement
N: Needs More Practice
U: Unsatisfactory
X: Concept not introduced at this time/concept to be introduced.

Teacher's Comments and Recommendations:

PROGRESO ESCOLAR

Nombre: _____ Fecha: _____

Grado: _____ Escuela: _____

Maestra: _____ Programa: Lectura _____
Matematica _____
ESL _____

Reporte del Semana	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Comunicacion Oral										
Lectura										
Escritura										
Matematica										
Actitud y Conducta										

Clave: S: Satisfactorio
I: Ha mejorado
N: Necesita mas practica
U: Inaceptable
X: Materia no introducida en este semestre

Comentarios y Recomendaciones de la Maestra:

APPENDIX G

WEEKLY LOG FORM

WEEKLY LOG FORM

DATE: / / _____

APPENDIX H

ESL INSERVICE PROGRAM FOR CONTENT-AREA TEACHERS

Office of

Compensatory Education
Chapter 1
ESL/Bilingual

Christine Piscitelli
Director

Phyllis Concepción
ESL/Bilingual
Supervisor

TO: ESL/Bilingual Staff

FROM: Christine Piscitelli/Phyllis Concepcion

DATE: May 10, 1990

RE: ESL INSERVICE PROGRAM FOR CONTENT-AREA TEACHERS

The Instructional Council has contacted the ESL/ Bilingual office to provide a staff development inservice for content-area teachers. If you wish to participate in the design and implementation of this program, return the completed form below to our office by May 30, 1990.

Thank you.

TEACHER: _____

[ ] Yes, I am interested in participating.

[ ] Sorry, I am not able to participate.

APPENDIX I

ESL STUDENT INTERIM REPORT

OLD BRIDGE TOWNSHIP

ESL STUDENT INTERIM REPORT

SCHOOL: _____ DATE: _____

Dear _____:

I regret to inform you that _____'s work has been meeting with some difficulty in the following subjects:

Arithmetic
English As A Second Language
Language Arts
Reading
Science
Social Studies
Spelling

We urge you to contact the school for a conference with his/her teacher as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Director ESL/Bilingual Program